



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,127	12/15/2003	Jose La Rosa Ducato	P03,0574	3610

7590 08/17/2006

SCHIFF HARDIN & WAITE

Patent Department  
6600 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/736,127

Applicant(s)

DUCATO ET AL.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 May 2006.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-40 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-40 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 5/31/06 to the application filed on 12/15/03, priority 12/20/02.
2. Claims 1-12 are canceled.
3. Claims 13-40 are added.
4. Claims 13-40 are pending in the case. Claims 13 and 27 are independent claims.

#### ***Priority***

5. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

6. The IDSs AL and AR are not considered since there are no translations for these documents. The AT document "Advanced Function Presentation—Programming Guide and Line Data Reference" is not considered since it is the same as the AS document, which is considered. The "Mixed Object Document Content Architecture Reference" should be AT instead of AU.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 13-14, 17, 21, 27-28, 31, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ooishi et al. (US 5,699,524, 12/16/97).

Regarding independent claim 13, Ooishi discloses:

- providing font conversion information, and creating in a first computer said resource-based document data stream comprising document data associated with an output font, and adding to said document data stream said font conversion information (figures 1 and 3, col 4, lines 40-51, col 3, lines 19-38)
- transferring from a first computer to a second computer said document data stream with said font conversion information (figures 1 and 3, col 2, lines 40-55)
- in said second computer preparing the document data stream, converting the output font into the target font (col 2, lines 4-40, col 4, lines 41-51, col 6, line 65 to col 7, line 2)

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, Ooishi discloses the document data stream is for output on an output device (col 7, lines 3-15: data in the data stream is for output on a display device; col 4, lines 6-10).

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 14, Ooishi discloses that said font conversion information comprises font conversion table provided as a resource (col 2, lines 35-55, col 5, lines 39-50, col 6, line 65 to col 7, line 23).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 21, which is dependent on claim 13, Ooishi discloses that said font conversion information comprises font conversion table stored in a resource file (col 2, lines 35-55, col 5, lines 39-50, col 6, line 65 to col 7, line 23).

Claims 27-28, 31, 35 are for a system for performing method claims 13-14, 17, 21, and are rejected under the same rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 15-16, 18-19, 29-30, 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooishi et al. (US 5,699,524, filed 3/17/95).

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Ooishi does not disclose explicitly that the output device comprises a print device. Instead, Ooishi discloses that data is transmitted to the work station at the reception side (col 7, lines 3-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Ooishi to include a print device into the output device of Ooishi since it is well known that any work station, which is a computer system, includes a printer for conveniently outputting data in paper form if there is such a request.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 14, Ooishi does not disclose explicitly that the output device comprises an archiving device. Instead, Ooishi discloses that data is transmitted to the work station at the reception side (col 7, lines 3-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Ooishi to include an archive device into the output device of Ooishi since it is well known that any work station, which is a computer system, includes a memory with archive function for storing data no longer in active use.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 14, Ooishi does not disclose explicitly that said conversion information comprises a reference to a font conversion table provided as a resource. However, Ooishi discloses the font conversion table provided as resource (col 2, lines 35-55, col 5, lines 39-50, col 6, line 65 to col 7, line 23: the conversion table which is used to convert character patterns in the two systems, and thus is considered the font conversion table).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Ooishi to include a reference to a font conversion table since it was well known that such a table should have a name to call during the conversion process. Including a name or a reference to a conversion table would make it easy to refer to said table when needed.

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent on claim 13, Ooishi discloses that said font conversion information comprises font conversion table provided as a resource (col 2, lines 35-55, col 5, lines 39-50, col 6, line 65 to col 7, line 23).

Ooishi does not disclose explicitly that said conversion information comprises a reference to a font conversion table provided as a resource. However, Ooishi discloses the font conversion table provided as resource (col 2, lines 35-55, col 5, lines 39-50, col 6, line 65 to col 7, line 23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Ooishi to include a reference to a font conversion table since it was well known that such a table should have a name to call during the conversion process. Including a name or a reference to a conversion table would make it easy to refer to said table when needed.

Claims 29-30, 32-33 are for a system for performing method claims 15-16, 32-33, and are rejected under the same rationale.

11. Claims 20, 22-23, 34, 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooishi as applied in claim 13 above, and further in view of Hirtenreiter et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2004/0036694, 2/26/04, filed 4/9/01).

Regarding claims 20 and 22, which are dependent on claims 13 and 21 respectively, Ooishi discloses does not disclose that the document data stream comprises an

Art Unit: 2178

Advanced Function Presentation data stream, and whereby the resource file comprises an object container.

Hirtenreiter discloses the document data stream comprises an Advanced Function Presentation data stream, and whereby the resource file comprises an object container ([0008], [0009]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Hirtenreiter into Ooishi since the Advanced Function Presentation data stream and the object container would provide the advantage to effectively render the document data stream for output on an output device.

Regarding claim 23 , which is dependent on claim 22, Ooishi does not disclose that a selection of the object container occurs via a job corollary file.

Hirtenreiter discloses selection of the object container occurs via a job corollary file ([0009], [0031]-[0032]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Hirtenreiter into Ooishi since said selection of the object container in Hirtenreiter would provide the advantage to effectively render the document data stream for output via printing.

Claims 34, 36-37 are for a system for performing method claims 20, 22-23, and are rejected under the same rationale.



12. Claims 24-26, 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooishi as applied in claim 13 above, and further in view of Manning (US Pat No. 6,043,826, 3/28/00, 9/2/97).

Regarding claim 24, which is dependent on claim 13, Ooishi discloses the document data and the font file at the second system (figure 3).

Ooishi does not disclose rastered document data are generated character-by-character and pixel-by-pixel in a rastering process using the target font and the document data.

Manning discloses rastered document data are generated character-by-character and pixel-by-pixel in a rastering process using the target font and the document data (col 5, lines 14-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Manning into Ooishi for obtaining rastered document data based on the target font, which is the font file at the receiving side, and the data transmitted to the target system.

Regarding claim 25, which is dependent on claim 24, Ooishi does not disclose that the raster matrices are used in the rastering process in which dot patterns of associated characters are stored.

Manning discloses that the raster matrices are used in the rastering process in which dot patterns of associated characters are stored (col 5, lines 14-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Manning into Ooishi for obtaining dot patterns of the characters of data during rastering process.

Regarding claim 26, which is dependent on claim 1, Ooishi does not disclose that the document data are generated pixel-by-pixel in a vector-allocation process using the target font and the document data.

Manning discloses that the document data are generated pixel-by-pixel in a vector-allocation process using the target font and the document data (col 5, lines 14-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Manning into Ooishi for obtaining data generated pixel-by-pixel using the target font in the data file at the receiving side and the data file transmitted to the receiving side.

Claims 38-40 are for a system for performing method claims 24-26, and are rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Choi et al. (US 6,232,987, filed 5/31/97).

Opstad et al. (US 7,064,757, filed 5/7/99).

Okamura (US 6,701,524, filed 5/30/97).

Yamanaka et al. (US 5,983,247, filed 5/29/97).

Lee (US 2003/0226118, filed 5/28/02).

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2178  
8/10/06